

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13 THE HONORABLE MARSHA J. PECHMAN  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

PROKOP LABS, LLC, a Washington  
limited liability company,

Plaintiff,

v.

STAPLES, INC., a Delaware corporation;  
STAPLES THE OFFICE SUPERSTORE  
LLC, a Delaware limited liability  
company; BELKIN, INC., a Delaware  
corporation (formerly BELKIN  
LOGISTICS, INC.), S.P. RICHARDS CO.,  
a Georgia corporation; and VELO  
ENTERPRISE CO., LTD., a Taiwan  
corporation,

Defendants.

No. 2:07-cv-1094-MJP

CR37 SUBMISSION REGARDING  
PLAINTIFF PROKOP LABS, LLC'S  
INTERROGATORY NO. 1 AND REQUEST  
FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18

NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:  
AUGUST 20, 2012

## I. PROKOP LABS, LLC'S INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

This patent infringement case concerns a patent directed to gel wrist rests: U.S. Patent No. 5,566,913. In late May of 2012, Prokop Labs issued discovery requests to Velo Enterprise Co. Ltd. seeking routine information relevant to infringement, including an identification of “gel” wrist rest products made, used, sold, offered for sale, or imported by Velo (Prokop Labs’ Interrogatory No. 1 to Velo), as well as production of documents showing the design, structure, and composition of the identified products (Prokop Labs’ Request for Production No. 18 to Velo). Prokop Labs needed this discovery because of the Court’s Scheduling Order, which requires all allegations of infringement to be included in the Prehearing Statement due on August 21, 2012. By late July of 2012, Prokop Labs realized it was not getting the discovery it requested from Velo.

As a result, Prokop Labs met and conferred with Velo, and the Parties reached an agreement about resolving this discovery dispute. Under that agreement:

- Velo verbally confirmed that its identification of gel wrist rest products (made, used, sold, offered for sale, or imported since July 13, 2001) in response to Interrogatory No. 1 was accurate and complete. At that time, Velo had identified 84 product model numbers.
- By August 3, 2012, Velo agreed it would produce documents sufficient to show structure, design, and composition for all of its identified gel wrist rest products.
- If the agreement broke down, Prokop Labs and Velo would agree to use the procedure set forth in CR 37(a)(1)(B) for resolving any dispute.

Declaration of Kevin A. Zeck, Ex. A (Email from K. Zeck to D. Weinstein, dated July 20, 2012).

As of August 9, 2012 (the date Prokop Labs served the draft of the CR 37(a)(1)(B) submission), Velo had not produced a single document in response to Prokop Labs' Request for Production No. 18, although it provided promises on August 9, 2012 that it would produce some unknown number of documents immediately. Zeck Decl., Ex. B (Letter from K. Zeck to B. Bailey, dated Aug. 8, 2012) and Ex. C (Letter from B. Bailey to K. Zeck, dated Aug. 9, 2012).

1 Moreover, although Velo previously provided assurances that its identification of “gel” wrist rest  
 2 products was complete, subsequent investigation by Prokop Labs revealed at least another fifty  
 3 products that appear not to have been identified. Zeck Decl., Ex. D (Letter from K. Zeck to B.  
 4 Bailey, dated August 1, 2012); *see also* Zeck Decl. Exs. E and F (exhibits from relevant U.S.  
 5 International Trade Commission Investigation cited in Ex. D). Velo has not provided any  
 6 concrete explanation for so large a discrepancy. Instead, Velo has generally theorized, without  
 7 substantiation, that the product numbers Prokop Labs identified either were sold before July 13,  
 8 2001 or are alternative product numbers for products already identified by Velo. Zeck Decl.,  
 9 Ex. C.

10 Prokop Labs has been prejudiced by Velo’s conduct. Prokop Labs will not obtain the  
 11 requested information in sufficient time to prepare the prehearing statement due on August 21,  
 12 2012. Prokop Labs therefore moves this Court for an order compelling Velo to produce the  
 13 requested information and also for relief from the Court’s requirement that all allegations of  
 14 infringement be included in the Prehearing Statement.

15 **II. VELO ENTERPRISE CO., LTD.’S STATEMENT**

16 This case was stayed from February of 2008 until April of 2012. Dkt. Nos. 61 (Order  
 17 Staying Case) and 72 (Order Lifting Stay). On April 3, 2012, the Court issued an Order lifting  
 18 the stay and setting a deadline of August 21, 2012 for filing the Prehearing Statement. Dkt. No.  
 19 72 at 1, line 23-2, line 1. Despite the almost five months of notice afforded to Prokop for  
 20 preparation of its Prehearing Statement, Prokop did not serve any discovery requests on Velo  
 21 until May 21, 2012, almost two months after the Court’s Order was issued. Zeck Decl., Exs. G, I  
 22 (Prokop’s Interrogatories Nos. 1-7 and Requests for Production Nos. 1-41). Velo provided  
 23 timely responses to Prokop’s discovery requests on June 25, 2012. Zeck Decl., Exs. H, J (Velo’s  
 24 Responses to Prokop’s Interrogatories and Requests for Production). In its responses, Velo  
 25 noted that confidential documents would only be produced after a protective order was entered in  
 26  
 27  
 28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51

1 the case. *Id.* Nonetheless, Prokop did not circulate a draft protective order until July 9, 2012.  
 2 Bailey Decl., Ex. K (Email from K. Zeck to Defendants, dated July 9, 2012).  
 3

4 Velo never agreed to produce documents sufficient to show structure, design, and  
 5 composition for all of its identified gel wrist rest products by August 3, 2012, absent entry of a  
 6 protective order to protect Velo's trade secrets and confidential information. Zeck Decl., Ex. C  
 7 (Letter from B. Bailey to K. Zeck, dated August 9, 2012). To the contrary, Velo has always  
 8 maintained that it would produce confidential documents once a protective order was in place.  
 9  
 10 *Id.*  
 11

12 The parties diligently worked on coming to terms on a proposed protective order, and  
 13 those terms were agreed upon on August 7, 2012. Bailey Decl., Exs. L, M (Emails from K. Zeck  
 14 to E. Chan, dated August 7, 2012). Despite the fact that the proposed protective order had not  
 15 yet been entered by the Court, and with the understanding that all parties were bound by the  
 16 agreed upon terms, Velo produced confidential documents to Prokop within days of agreement  
 17 of the terms on August 10, 2012 and August 14, 2012. Zeck Decl., Ex. C (Letter from K. Zeck,  
 18 dated August 9, 2012); Bailey Decl., Ex. O (Letter from B. Bailey to K. Zeck, dated August 14,  
 19 2012). Those productions comprised over 5,000 pages of documents and included all the  
 21 technical documents known to Velo at the time that related to the identified model numbers. *Id.*  
 22 Further, the documents were produced to Prokop in the same manner as they are kept in Velo's  
 23 usual course of business. *Id.*  
 24

25 Velo has also thoroughly investigated Prokop's claims that exhibits filed in a 2001  
 26 International Trade Commission ("ITC") litigation by 3M Innovative Properties and ACCO  
 27 Brands, Inc. contain relevant, undisclosed gel wrist rest products manufactured by Velo. Zeck  
 28 Decl. Ex., D (Letter from K. Zeck to B. Bailey, dated August 1, 2012). The ITC exhibits at issue  
 29 list 53 gel wrist rest products purportedly manufactured by Velo. Zeck Decl., Exs. E, F (Exhibits  
 30 from 2001 ITC litigation). Despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of model numbers  
 31 listed in the ITC exhibits are not current Velo model numbers, or not Velo model numbers at all,  
 32

1 Velo was able to determine that 18 of the 53 models listed in the ITC exhibits correspond with  
2 Velo model numbers that appear relevant to this case and were not previously identified in  
3 Velo's response to Prokop's interrogatories. Bailey Decl., Ex. R (Chart identifying Velo model  
4 numbers). The remaining models are irrelevant to this case because: (1) the corresponding Velo  
5 model number had already been identified in Velo's interrogatory responses; (2) the  
6 corresponding Velo model number does not contain a "gel" component; (3) the corresponding  
7 Velo model number could not be identified; or (4) the corresponding Velo model number has not  
8 been sold or imported into the U.S. since July 13, 2001 (these model numbers being irrelevant in  
9 light of the six-year statutory bar on damages for patent infringement). *Id.* A chart identifying  
10 the 53 model numbers listed in the ITC litigation, their corresponding Velo model number, and  
11 the conclusion of Velo's investigation regarding each model number has been provided to  
12 Prokop and is included in this motion as Exhibit O. *Id.*

13 As part of its ongoing investigation, Velo immediately served its Third Supplemental  
14 Response to Prokop's Interrogatory No. 1 on August 16, 2012, adding 18 relevant model  
15 numbers to its interrogatory responses. Zeck Decl., Ex. V (Velo's Responses to Prokop's  
16 Interrogatories). Velo will make good faith efforts to collect, review, and produce documents  
17 pertaining to these model numbers and responsive to Prokop's discovery requests as soon as  
18 possible.

19 Velo has never opposed production of documents responsive to Prokop's discovery  
20 requests with respect to technical documents and has produced well over 5,000 pages of  
21 documents and CAD files responsive to Prokop's requests. Bailey Decl., Ex. O (Letter from B.  
22 Bailey to K. Zeck, dated August 14, 2012). Further, Velo has at all times supplemented its  
23 discovery responses as it learned new information, and has made every effort to collect, review,  
24 and produce responsive documents in a timely manner. Velo will continue to do so. As such,  
25 Prokop has not been unjustly prejudiced by Velo's conduct.

1           Despite significant expenditure of time and effort by Velo and its attorneys, Prokop has  
 2 yet to produce a single document in response to the discovery requests served on it on June 5,  
 3 2012. *Id.* On August 7, 2012, counsel for Prokop stated, “[N]ow that we have agreed to the  
 4 proposed protective order, we believe that document production can begin in earnest.” Bailey  
 5 Decl., Ex. M (Email from K. Zeck to Eric Chan, dated August 7, 2012). The parties’ agreement  
 6 is further memorialized in Velo’s letter of August 9, 2012 to Prokop. Zeck Decl., Ex. C (Letter  
 7 from B. Bailey to K. Zeck, dated August 9, 2012). As noted above, the parties’ mutual  
 8 agreement to the terms of the proposed protective order facilitated Velo’s aforementioned  
 9 document productions of August 10, 2012 and August 14, 2012. Zeck Decl., Ex. C (Letter from  
 10 K. Zeck, dated August 9, 2012); Bailey Decl., Ex. O (Letter from B. Bailey to K. Zeck, dated  
 11 August 14, 2012). Yet, as late as August 15, 2012, Prokop has withheld all document production  
 12 from Defendants, asserting either that the terms of a protective order have not been agreed to  
 13 (Bailey Decl., Ex. P (Second Letter from K. Zeck to B. Bailey, dated August 14, 2012)) or  
 14 Defendants had not confirmed the agreement in writing. Bailey Decl., Ex. Q (Email from K.  
 15 Zeck to Defendants, dated August 15, 2012). Prokop’s refusal to produce even a single  
 16 document is difficult to reconcile with its allegations that Prokop has been unjustly prejudiced by  
 17 purported flaws in Velo’s production.

### 35           **III.     DISPUTED DISCOVERY REQUESTS**

36           **Prokop Labs’ Interrogatory No. 1:** “Identify all Gel Wrist Rest Products.” “Gel Wrist Rest  
 37 Products” was defined as “any wrist rest containing a gel or gelatinous material that was made,  
 38 used, sold, or offered for sale in the United States, or imported into the United States, by Velo  
 39 Enterprise Co., Ltd., since October 22, 1996.” Zeck Decl., Ex. G at 2, 5 (Excerpts of Interrogs.  
 40 Nos. 1-7 to Velo).

41           **Velo’s Third Supplemental Response:** “Subject to and without waiving the foregoing  
 42 objections, Velo responds as follows:

1 Velo will limit this response to the identification of products that Velo sold or offered for  
 2 sale from six years before the filing of the Complaint to the present, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 286.  
 3 Velo refers to the revised list below, which represents a complete list of wrist rest products  
 4 known to Velo that Velo has manufactured for U.S. customers and that Velo has been able to  
 5 identify after a thorough and diligent search of its records. This list supersedes the lists set forth  
 6 in Velo's previous Responses to Prokop Labs, LLC's Interrogatories Nos. 1-7.  
 7  
 8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12

13 01M004; 01M034; 02K003-02; 02K006; 02K007; 02K013; 02K024; 02K025; 02K027;  
 14 02K037; 02K048; 02K061; 02K064; 02K068; 02K075; 02K088; 02K093; 02K106; 02K136;  
 15 02M002; 02M005; 02M006; 02M011; 02M012; 02M024; 02M033; 02M057; 02M058; 02M066;  
 16 02W033; 03K068; 03K068-1; 03K068-2; 03K075; 03K120-1; 03K132; 03M047; 03M057;  
 17 03M057-1; 03M057-2; 03M058; 03M117; 03M122; 03W033; 03W068; 03W091; 04M058;  
 18 04W024; 09M121-1; 09M128; 22701; 22711B; 34702A; 36505; 36702A; 57711A; K60004B;  
 19 KY062LGP; KY3-LGP; L12012; L22701C; L34702B; L35501B; L36702C; L57711B;  
 20 L62083B; L62084A; L62085A; L62086A; L62093A; L62094B; L62113; L62114; L62116;  
 21 L62117; L62118; L62119; M16-1; M16-LGP; M16-1LGP; WP21LGP; WP25LGP; WP25TGP;  
 22 WP28LGP; WT25LGP+TPU; 鍵盤護墊2.5; and 鍵盤護墊 3.0.” Zeck Decl., Ex. V at 5 (Velo's  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51

1  
2  
3 **Prokop Labs' Request for Product No. 18:** "Documents sufficient to show the types, versions,  
4 and models of Gel Wrist Rest Products, including without limitation documents sufficient to  
5 show the structure and composition of each Gel Wrist Rest Product, and including without  
6 limitation documents sufficient to show the chemical or molecular composition of any gel or  
7 gelatinous material in each Gel Wrist Rest Product." Zeck Decl., Ex. I at 6 (Excerpts of Req. for  
8 Prod. Nos. 1-41 to Velo).

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 **Velo's Response:** "In addition to its General Objections, Velo specifically objects to Request  
17 No. 18 as overly broad, unduly burdensome, and not reasonably calculated to lead to the  
18 discovery of admissible evidence. Velo also specifically objects to this Request as premature on  
19 the ground that it seeks disclosure of expert testimony. Velo specifically objects to this Request  
20 to the extent that it calls for the production of confidential information without a protective order  
21 that sufficiently protects Velo's and third parties' rights.

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing and general objections, and consistent with  
32 Velo's understanding of the various terms used in this Request, Velo will produce non-  
33 privileged, non-confidential, responsive documents at an appropriate time to the extent that such  
34 documents exist and can be located following a reasonable search. Velo will produce non-  
35 privileged, responsive, and confidential documents at an appropriate time once a protective order  
36 is entered in this case that sufficiently protects Velo's and third parties' rights." Zeck Decl., Ex. J  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 at 18-19 (Velo's Responses to Prokop Labs' Req. for Prod. Nos. 1-41).

1           **A. Prokop Labs' Argument - Velo Has Not Provided Basic Information Necessary for**  
 2           **Prokop Labs to Comply with the Court's Deadline for the Prehearing Statement**

3           This case was stayed from February of 2008 until April of 2012. Dkt. Nos. 61 (Order  
 4           Staying Case) and 72 (Order Lifting Stay). In April, the Court lifted the stay and set a case  
 5           schedule. Dkt. No. 72 (Order Lifting Stay). One of the deadlines in the schedule concerns a  
 6           “Joint Claim Construction Chart and Prehearing Statement.” *Id.* at 1, line 23 to 2, line 1. The  
 7           chart and prehearing statement are due on August 21, 2012. *Id.*

8           In its order lifting the stay, the Court said that the prehearing statement must contain  
 9           “[a]ll allegations of infringement.” *Id.* at 5, line 10. The Court also said that it “will not consider  
 10           new allegations of infringement . . . without the asserting party showing good cause.” *Id.* at 5,  
 11           lines 11-12. The Court further said that “failure to complete discovery within the time allowed is  
 12           not recognized as good cause.” *Id.* at 3, line 10-12.

13           Prokop Labs has endeavored meet the Court’s expectations. Two months ago, Prokop  
 14           Labs served discovery requests seeking, among other things: (1) an identification of all gel wrist  
 15           rests made, used, sold, offered for sale, or imported by Velo; and (2) documents sufficient to  
 16           show the design, structure, and composition of the identified products. *E.g.*, Zeck Decl., Ex. G  
 17           at 2, 5 (Excerpts of Interrogs. to Velo) and Ex. I at 6 (Excerpts of Req. for Prod. to Velo). These  
 18           are routine requests relevant to infringement.

19           Since then, Velo has not produced even one requested document.<sup>1</sup> This is so even though  
 20           the Parties agreed that Velo would produce documents in response to Request for Production  
 21           No. 18 by August 3, 2012. Zeck Decl., Ex. A. Moreover, Velo’s initial identification of Gel  
 22           Wrist Products appears to be incomplete.<sup>2</sup> Investigation by Prokop Labs revealed a number of

23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45           <sup>1</sup> This does not include prior art produced by the Defendants at the time Defendants served their invalidity  
 46           contentions, nor does it include dictionary definitions produced by the Defendants at the time Defendants served  
 47           their proposed claim constructions.

48  
 49  
 50  
 51           <sup>2</sup> Velo’s initial identification of products was contained in its Responses to Prokop Labs, LLC’s Interrogatories  
 Nos. 1-7. Velo identified eighty-four products in its Responses to Prokop Labs’ Interrogatory No. 1. Zeck Decl.,  
 Ex. H (excerpts from Velo’s Responses to Prokop Labs’ Interrogs. Nos. 1-7).

1 Velo gel wrist rest products previously identified in a 2001 International Trade Commission  
 2 Investigation but not in this litigation. Velo has not provided a detailed explanation for why this  
 3 is so – Velo has provided only conclusory explanations. Zeck Decl., Exs. D, E, F, and C.  
 4  
 5

6 Simply put, Velo has not provided a sufficient response to Prokop Labs' Interrogatory  
 7 No. 1 and Request for Production No. 18 in light of its obligations under the Federal Rules of  
 8 Civil Procedure. Velo has also not lived up to its obligations under the agreement reached  
 9 between the Parties on July 20, 2012. As a result, Velo has prejudiced Prokop Labs' ability to  
 10 complete the Prehearing Statement according to the requirements set forth in the Court's  
 11 Scheduling Order. Prokop Labs therefore respectfully requests that this Court compel Velo to  
 12 provide a complete identification of all Gel Wrist Rest Products made, used, sold, offered for  
 13 sale in the United States by Velo on or after July 13, 2001, or imported into the United States by  
 14 Velo on or after July 13, 2001. Prokop Labs also respectfully requests that this Court compel  
 15 Velo to provide documents sufficient to show the structure, design, and composition of the  
 16 identified products. Prokop Labs finally requests that it be relieved from the requirement that  
 17 "all allegations of infringement" be contained in the Prehearing Statement due to the practical  
 18 reality that, even if this Court compels the requested discovery, it will not be produced in  
 19 sufficient time to allow Prokop labs to adequately prepare the Prehearing Statement.  
 20  
 21

22 **B. Velo's Response - Velo Has Provided Prokop with All Known Documents  
 23 Responsive to Prokop's Request for Production No. 18**

24 As discussed above, on April 3, 2012, the Court issued an Order lifting the stay and  
 25 setting a deadline of August 21, 2012 for filing the Prehearing Statement. Dkt. No. 72 at 1, line  
 26 23-2, line 1. On May 21, 2012, almost two months after the Court issued its Order, Prokop  
 27 served its first discovery requests on Velo. Zeck Decl. Exs. G, I (Prokop's Interrogatories Nos.  
 28 1-7 and Requests for Production Nos. 1-41). Velo provided timely responses to Prokop's  
 29 discovery requests on June 25, 2012. Zeck Decl. Exs. H, J (Velo's Responses to Prokop's  
 30 Interrogatories and Requests for Production).  
 31

1                   Contrary to Prokop's assertions, Velo never agreed to produce documents sufficient to  
 2 show structure, design, and composition for all of its identified gel wrist rest products by August  
 3 3, 2012, absent an agreement on a protective order. Zeck Decl., Ex. C (Letter from B. Bailey to  
 4 K. Zeck, dated August 9, 2012). Rather, as stated in Velo's response to Prokop's Requests for  
 5 Production, Velo has consistently maintained that it would produce confidential documents once  
 6 a protective order was in place. *Id.* This fact notwithstanding, Plaintiff Prokop failed to circulate  
 7 a draft protective order until July 9, 2012. Bailey Decl. Ex. K (Email from K. Zeck to  
 8 Defendants, dated July 9, 2012).

16                   The terms of a protective order were agreed upon on August 7, 2012. Bailey Decl., Exs.  
 17 L, M (Emails from K. Zeck to E. Chan, dated August 7, 2012). Based on the understanding that  
 18 all parties were bound by the agreed upon terms, Velo produced confidential documents to  
 19 Prokop on August 10, 2012 and August 14, 2012. Zeck Decl., Ex. C (Letter from K. Zeck, dated  
 20 August 9, 2012); Bailey Decl., Ex. O (Letter from B. Bailey to K. Zeck, dated August 14, 2012).  
 21 The two productions comprise over 5,000 pages of documents and CAD files. Prokop is now in  
 22 possession of technical documents, including drawings, Bill of Materials ("BOMs"), and  
 23 Material Safety Data Sheets ("MSDS") for every product model number listed in Velo's  
 24 response to Prokop's Interrogatory No. 1 known on August 14, 2012. Bailey Decl., Ex. O  
 25 (Letter from B. Bailey to K. Zeck, dated August 14, 2012). Further, the documents were  
 26 produced to Prokop in the same manner as they are kept in Velo's usual course of business. *Id.*  
 27  
 28

39                   Additionally, Velo has thoroughly investigated Prokop's claims that exhibits filed in the  
 40 2001 International Trade Commission ("ITC") litigation by 3M Innovative Properties and ACCO  
 41 Brands, Inc. contain relevant, undisclosed gel wrist rest products manufactured by Velo. Bailey  
 42 Decl., Ex. R (Chart identifying Velo model numbers). The exhibits list 53 gel wrist rest products  
 43 purportedly manufactured by Velo. Zeck Decl., Exs. E, F (Exhibits from 2001 ITC litigation).  
 44 As an initial matter, Velo notes that the lists are over ten years old. *Id.* Thus, the overwhelming  
 45 majority of model numbers are not presented in a format Velo currently uses. Moreover, many  
 46  
 47

1 of the model numbers are not Velo model numbers at all. Rather, they are model numbers used  
 2 by Velo's customers. Nonetheless, Velo was eventually able to determine that 18 of the 53  
 3 models listed in the ITC exhibits correspond with Velo model numbers that appear relevant to  
 4 this case and were not previously identified in Velo's response to Prokop's interrogatories.  
 5 Bailey Decl., Ex. R (Chart identifying Velo model numbers). The remaining models are  
 6 irrelevant to this case because: (1) the corresponding Velo model number had already been  
 7 identified in Velo's interrogatory responses; (2) the corresponding Velo model number does not  
 8 contain a "gel" component; (3) the corresponding Velo model number could not be identified; or  
 9 (4) the corresponding Velo model number has not been sold or imported into the U.S. since July  
 10 13, 2001 (these model numbers being irrelevant in light of the six-year statutory bar on damages  
 11 for patent infringement). *Id.*

22 Having concluded its investigation into these model numbers, Velo served its Third  
 23 Supplemental Response to Prokop's Interrogatory No. 1 on August 16, 2012, adding the 18  
 24 relevant model numbers to its interrogatory responses. Zeck Decl., Ex. V (Velo's Responses to  
 25 Prokop's Interrogatories). As always, Velo will make good faith efforts to expeditiously collect,  
 26 review, and produce documents related to these additional model numbers and responsive to  
 27 Prokop's discovery requests.

28 Regarding Prokop's complaint that a substantial number of the documents, including the  
 29 BOMs and MSDS that Velo has produced are in Mandarin, Velo is a Taiwanese company whose  
 30 employees' native spoken language is Mandarin or Taiwanese. Velo has produced responsive  
 31 documents in the same manner as they are kept in Velo's usual course of business. Bailey Decl.,  
 32 Ex. O (Letter from B. Bailey to K. Zeck, dated August 14, 2012). It should not be surprising to  
 33 Prokop that Velo's documents contain Chinese. Further, Velo is not required to translate the  
 34 documents for Prokop. If Prokop does not have the resources to translate the Chinese-language  
 35 documents, it should have served its discovery requests and proposed protective order sooner,  
 36 thereby affording Prokop more time to prepare its Prehearing Statement.

1 Prokop also complains that the technical drawings provided in the document productions  
 2 of August 10, 2012, and August 14, 2012 are too simple to generate the infringement contentions  
 3 required by the Court's April 3, 2012 Order. Bailey Decl., Ex. N (First letter from K. Zeck to B.  
 4 Bailey, dated August 14, 2012). Velo notes, however, that it has produced all known technical  
 5 documents pertaining to the identified product models. Bailey Decl., Ex. O (Letter from B.  
 6 Bailey to K. Zeck, dated August 14, 2012).

7 Velo has also produced native CAD files to Prokop with file extensions \*.mf1 and \*.mf2.  
 8 Velo has identified that these files were created using a CAD program that may be opened using  
 9 the program "NX I-deas." Bailey Decl., Ex. N (First letter from K. Zeck to B. Bailey, dated  
 10 August 14, 2012). Prokop complains that Velo has not provided Prokop with the software  
 11 program and, as a result, Prokop cannot view the drawings. *Id.* However, Velo has no duty to  
 12 provide such a program to Prokop. Again, Velo has produced the drawings in the same manner  
 13 as they are kept in Velo's usual course of business. Bailey Decl., Ex. O (Letter from B. Bailey to  
 14 K. Zeck, dated August 14, 2012). Moreover, NX I-deas is not a free software program, and Velo  
 15 is not licensed to distribute copies. If Prokop would like to view the \*.mf1 and \*.mf2 files,  
 16 Prokop should purchase a copy of NX I-deas or a comparable program in which to view the files.

17 Lastly, Prokop complains that Velo has produced documentation that references product  
 18 model numbers not identified in Velo's responses to Prokop's discovery requests. Bailey Decl.,  
 19 Ex. N (First letter from K. Zeck to B. Bailey, dated August 14, 2012). Velo does not believe this  
 20 is improper. Velo gathered, reviewed, and produced responsive documents as quickly as  
 21 possible. Velo concedes that it is entirely possible that documents were produced that reference  
 22 product models that are not relevant to this litigation for one reason or another. Prokop should  
 23 not assume that just because Velo produced documents containing references to model numbers  
 24 that are not identified in Velo's discovery request responses, those model numbers are relevant to  
 25 this litigation or that Velo is intentionally withholding or obscuring information from Prokop.

1 Velo has never refused to produce documents responsive to Prokop's discovery requests.  
2 In fact, Velo has produced well over 5,000 pages of documents, including drawings, BOMs, and  
3 MSDS for every model number identified in response to Prokop's Interrogatory No. 1, with the  
4 exception of those 18 model numbers recently discovered as part of Velo's ongoing obligation to  
5 continue investigating and supplementing its interrogatory responses. Velo intends to collect,  
6 review, and produce documents pertaining to those 18 model numbers as soon as possible.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12 Velo's document production stands in sharp contrast to Prokop's discovery tactics. To  
13 date, Prokop has yet to produce a single document in response to the discovery requests served  
14 on it on June 5, 2012. Bailey Decl., Ex. O (Letter from B. Bailey to K. Zeck, dated August 14,  
15 2012). Of particular interest to Velo are licensing agreements between Prokop and Velo's  
16 customers related to the '913 patent, as Velo believes that many of its sales may be to licensed  
17 customers. *Id.* During a telephone conversation on August 8, 2012, Prokop admitted to being in  
18 possession of the agreements, but refused to provide them until all parties had agreed upon the  
19 terms of the protective order. *Id.* Prokop made this assertion despite the fact that all parties had  
20 agreed to the terms of the protective order on the previous day, August 7, 2012. Bailey Decl.,  
21 Exs. L, M (Emails from K. Zeck to E. Chan, dated August 7, 2012). As late as August 15, 2012,  
22 Prokop has withheld all document production from Defendants, asserting that Defendants have  
23 not confirmed their agreement to the terms of the protective order in writing. Bailey Decl., Ex.  
24 Q (Email from K. Zeck to Defendants, dated August 15, 2012). However, in its letter of August  
25 9, 2012, Velo makes clear that the terms of the protective order were agreed upon, in writing.  
26 Zeck Decl., Ex. C (Letter from B. Bailey to K. Zeck dated August 9, 2012).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

Velo has at all times supplemented its discovery responses as it learned new information,  
and has made every effort to collect, review, and produce responsive documents in a timely  
manner. Velo will continue to do so. Prokop has not been unjustly prejudiced by Velo's  
conduct. To the contrary, if Prokop has been prejudiced, it is by Prokop's own belated discovery

1 requests, failure to timely propose a protective order given the pressures of which it was aware,  
2 and failure to make adequate preparations to review Velo's document productions.  
3  
4

5 **C. Prokop Labs' Reply**

6 Velo's Response ignores the central issue in this motion: Velo's failure to identify its  
7 wrist rest products, and its corresponding failure to produce documents showing the structure and  
8 configuration of its products. Many Velo products known to Prokop have not been the subject of  
9 any Velo production, and the drawings Velo has produced have little detail. Velo's bills of  
10 materials are not linked to the drawings, and Velo provided only simple pictures and parts lists  
11 that omitted the information needed to understand how the products are put together. *See* Bailey  
12 Decl., Ex. N; Zeck Decl., Ex. S. Velo's production has even been contradictory: Velo provided  
13 three supplemental identifications since August 9th, each with a different total number of Velo  
14 wrist rest products. *See* Zeck Decl., Exs. T (70 products), U (69 products), V (87 products).  
15  
16

17 The deficiencies and contradictions in Velo's discovery go the heart of the case, and  
18 prevent Prokop from completing its infringement contentions. Velo should be compelled to  
19 provide a complete identification of its gel wrist rest products, and produce documents sufficient  
20 to allow Prokop to finish the infringement contentions.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

1  
2 Respectfully submitted for Prokop Labs, LLC by:  
3  
4  
5

6 DATED: August 20, 2012

7 By: /s/ Kevin A. Zeck  
8 Jerry A. Riedinger #25828  
9 Kevin A. Zeck #41689  
10 **Perkins Coie LLP**  
11 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900  
12 Seattle, WA 98101-3099  
13 Telephone: 206.359.8000  
14 Facsimile: 206.359.9000  
15 Email: JRiedinger@perkinscoie.com  
KZeck@perkinscoie.com

16  
17 *Attorneys for Plaintiff PROPOKOP LABS, LLC,*  
18 *a Washington limited liability company*

19  
20  
21 Respectfully submitted for Velo Enterprise Co. Ltd. by:  
22  
23

24 DATED: August 20, 2012

25 By: /s/Benjamin D. Bailey (with permission)  
26 John H. Jamnback. WSB No. 29872  
27 YARMUTH WILSON CALFO, PLCC  
28 Fourth & Madison  
29 925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2500  
30 Seattle, WA 98104

31  
32 Douglas S. Weinstein (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
33 Benjamin D. Bailey (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
34 FINNEGAN HENDERSON  
35 FARABOW GARRETT & DUNNER LLP  
36 303 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 3500  
37 Atlanta, GA 30308-6470

38  
39 *Attorneys for Defendant VELO ENTERPRISE*  
40 *CO. LTD & Third Party Defendants AIDATA*  
41 *USA CO. INC and AIDMA ENTERPRISE CO.*  
42 *LTD.*

## CERTIFICATION:

I certify that prior to making this submission Prokop Labs, LLC, has in good faith conferred or attempted to confer with Velo Enterprise Co. Ltd., in an effort to obtain the requested discovery without court action, in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(1).

DATED: August 9, 2012

By: /s/ Kevin A. Zeck  
Jerry A. Riedinger #25828  
Kevin A. Zeck #41689  
**Perkins Coie LLP**  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900  
Seattle, WA 98101-3099  
Telephone: 206.359.8000  
Facsimile: 206.359.9000  
Email: [JRiedinger@perkinscoie.com](mailto:JRiedinger@perkinscoie.com)  
[KZeck@perkinscoie.com](mailto:KZeck@perkinscoie.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff PROPOKOP LABS, LLC,  
a Washington limited liability company*

CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH CR 37(a)(1)(B):

I certify that the foregoing CR 37 Submission complies with the requirements of CR 37(a)(1)(B).

DATED: August 20, 2012

By: /s/ Kevin A. Zeck  
Jerry A. Riedinger #25828  
Kevin A. Zeck #41689  
**Perkins Coie LLP**  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900  
Seattle, WA 98101-3099  
Telephone: 206.359.8000  
Facsimile: 206.359.9000  
Email: [JRiedinger@perkinscoie.com](mailto:JRiedinger@perkinscoie.com)  
[KZeck@perkinscoie.com](mailto:KZeck@perkinscoie.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff PROPOKOP LABS, LLC,  
a Washington limited liability company*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on August 9, 2012, I served a draft of the CR 37(a)(1)(B) submission, as well as the accompanying draft declaration of Kevin A. Zeck and draft exhibits A-J to the Zeck declaration, on the following persons via the method indicated below:

Attorneys for Velo Enterprise Co., Ltd.,  by CM/ECF  
Aidma Enterprise Co. Ltd., and Aidata USA  by Electronic Mail  
Co., Inc.:  by Facsimile Transmission  
Douglas Weinstein  by First Class Mail  
douglas.weinstein@finnegan.com  by Hand Delivery  
Benjamin D. Bailey  by Overnight Delivery  
benjamin.bailey@finnegan.com

William Dyer  
bill.dyer@finnegan.com

Finnegan Henderson Farabow  
Garrett & Dunner LLP  
303 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 3500  
Atlanta, GA 30308-3263  
Phone: (404) 653-6470  
Fax: (404) 653-6444

John H Jamnback  by CM/ECF  
jjamnback@yarmuth.com  by Electronic Mail  
Yarmuth Wilson Calfo PLLC  by Facsimile Transmission  
Fourth & Madison  by First Class Mail  
925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2500  by Hand Delivery  
Seattle WA 98104  by Overnight Delivery  
Tel: (206) 516-3800

/s/ *Kevin A. Zeck*

Kevin A. Zeck

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on August 20, 2012, I served the foregoing document, the Declaration of Kevin A. Zeck in support of the Prokop Labs, LLC's CR 37 Submission, the Declaration of Benjamin D. Bailey opposing Prokop's CR 37 Submission, the exhibits attached to the declarations of Kevin A. Zeck and Benjamin D. Bailey, and the Proposed Order Granting CR 37 Submission, on the following persons via the method indicated below:

Attorneys for Belkin, Inc., formerly Belkin  by **CM/ECF**  
Logistics, Inc.:  by **Electronic Mail**  
Ryan Yagura  by **Facsimile Transmission**  
ryagura@omm.com  by **First Class Mail**  
Vision L Winter  by **Hand Delivery**  
vwinter@omm.com  by **Overnight Delivery**  
Todd Fitzsimmons  
tfitzsimmons@omm.com  
O'Melveny & Myers LLP  
400 S Hope Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899

Michael A. Moore mmoore@corrchronin.com Corr Cronin Michelson Baumgardner & Preece LLP 1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 3900 Seattle, WA 98154-1051	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> by CM/ECF <input type="checkbox"/> by Electronic Mail <input type="checkbox"/> by Facsimile Transmission <input type="checkbox"/> by First Class Mail <input type="checkbox"/> by Hand Delivery <input type="checkbox"/> by Overnight Delivery
---	---

Attorneys for Staples, Inc. and Staples the  
Office Superstore, LLC:  by CM/ECF  
Ryan Yagura  by Electronic Mail  
ryagura@omm.com  by Facsimile Transmission  
O'Melveny & Myers LLP  by First Class Mail  
400 S Hope Street  by Hand Delivery  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899  by Overnight Delivery

Michael A. Moore  
mmoore@corrchronin.com  
Corr Cronin Michelson  
Baumgardner & Preece LLP  
1001 Fourth Avenue, Suite 3900  
Seattle WA 98154-1051

1 Attorneys for S.P. Richards Co.:2 John M Bowler  
3 john.bowler@troutmansanders.com  
4 Troutman Sanders LLP  
5 600 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 5200  
6 Atlanta, GA 30308-2216

by **CM/ECF**  
 by **Electronic Mail**  
 by **Facsimile Transmission**  
 by **First Class Mail**  
 by **Hand Delivery**  
 by **Overnight Delivery**

7 Thomas R Merrick  
8 tmerrick@mhlseattle.com  
9 Merrick, Hofstedt & Lindsey, PS  
10 3101 Western Avenue, Suite 200  
11 Seattle, WA 98121-3017  
12 Phone: (206) 682-0610  
13 Fax: (206) 467-2689

by **CM/ECF**  
 by **Electronic Mail**  
 by **Facsimile Transmission**  
 by **First Class Mail**  
 by **Hand Delivery**  
 by **Overnight Delivery**

16 Attorneys for Velo Enterprise Co., Ltd.,  
17 Aidata USA Co. Inc., and Aidma Enterprise  
18 Co. Ltd.:19 Douglas Weinstein  
20 douglas.weinstein@finnegan.com  
21 Benjamin D. Bailey  
22 benjamin.bailey@finnegan.com  
23 William Dyer  
24 bill.dyer@finnegan.com  
25 Finnegan Henderson Farabow  
26 Garrett & Dunner LLP  
27 303 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 3500  
28 Atlanta, GA 30308-3263  
29 Phone: (404) 653-6470  
30 Fax: (404) 653-6444

by **CM/ECF**  
 by **Electronic Mail**  
 by **Facsimile Transmission**  
 by **First Class Mail**  
 by **Hand Delivery**  
 by **Overnight Delivery**

33 John H Jamnback  
34 jjamnback@yarmuth.com  
35 Yarmuth Wilsdon Calfo PLLC  
36 Fourth & Madison  
37 925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2500  
38 Seattle WA 98104  
39 Tel: (206) 516-3800

by **CM/ECF**  
 by **Electronic Mail**  
 by **Facsimile Transmission**  
 by **First Class Mail**  
 by **Hand Delivery**  
 by **Overnight Delivery**

44 */s/ Kevin A. Zeck*

45 Kevin A. Zeck

46

47

48

49

50

51